

Amendments to Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings (Page 2 of 4) includes changes to FIGS. 2 and 3. This Replacement Sheet, which includes FIGS. 2 and 3, replaces the original sheet including FIGS. 2 and 3.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet 2 of 4 / FIG(S). 2 and 3

REMARKS

Without acquiescing to the propriety of the rejections in the Final Office Action dated May 11, 2010, claim 1 has been amended. Entry of the amendments, reconsideration of the present patent application and allowance of all claims pending herein are respectfully requested in view of the remarks below. Claims 1-11 are now pending.

Claim Objections:

The claims stand objected to as including the expression “configured to” and applicant is advised to use a different positive expression such as “for controlling”. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office’s allegations relative to the expression “configured to”, but the claims have been amended as suggested by the Office Action to facilitate prosecution of the present application.

Drawing Objections:

The drawings stand objected to for various informalities including a suggestion to show teeth of pinion 8 in FIG. 9. Applicant respectfully disagrees that it is necessary to explicitly add teeth of pinion 8 as suggested in the Office Action. It would be clear to one of ordinary skill in the art that pinion 8 includes teeth or other means for cooperating with a pinion knotted at the end of a cutting-blade support as described in paragraph [0033] of the published application. However, applicant has added radially extending teeth to FIG. 9 as requested in the Office Action. Accordingly, this objection is believed to be overcome.

Also, the angular spacing α is indicated as not being shown in the claims and such showing is required. Applicant has deleted the term “ α ” from the claims and thus this objection is believed to be overcome. Applicant respectfully points out that support for the “angular spacing” is provided in at least paragraph [0034] of published application and in FIGS. 2-5.

Also, the drawings were objected to because the reference character “element 29” was included in the drawing but not described in the specification. FIGS. 2 and 3 have been amended to delete “29” and “29a” which were substituted by “23” and “23a”. Support for this change is

found in the specification and drawings as originally filed. Thus, this objection is believed to be overcome.

Specification Objections:

The specification stands objected to under 37 CFR § 1.71 because on page 11, line 38, (paragraph **[0036]** of the published application) reads “pinion (P7) meshing with the pinion (P4)” and is alleged that this would not be possible given the drawings. This paragraph has been amended to substitute “P3” for “P4”. Support for this amendment is found in the drawings and specification as originally filed. The remaining objections relative to the movement of pinion 7 relative to pinion 4 are believed to be moot based on this amendment. Thus, this objection is believed to be overcome.

Element 23 is objected to due to the use of the language of “operating lever”. The Office Action appears to allege that element 23 reciprocates but does not pivot and thus should not be called a lever. Applicant respectfully disagrees that it is necessary to change this language. It is clear to one of ordinary skill in art what is referred to by operating lever 23 and further that applicant is entitled to define his own terms in the context in the specifications and drawings. Thus, this objection is believed to be overcome.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112:

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Relative to claim 1, the phrase “the selector devices position, from a lateral flange of the housing, on an outside and an inside of the housing” is allegedly confusing. It is questioned how the selector could be located both inside and outside of the flange and is alleged that the operating lever appears to be outside of the flange. Applicant respectfully submits that from a review of FIGS. 2-5 that selector device 23 (previously indicated as 29) is located both on an outside and an inside of a flange having three zones (i.e. 10a, 10b, 10c). Thus, because operating lever 23 is located on an exterior surface and an interior surface of the device, this rejection is believed to be overcome.

The Office Action also rejects claim 1 because the limitation “the selector device” in paragraphs [0004], [0005] and [0006] is alleged to lack antecedent basis. Applicant respectfully submits that antecedent basis for “the selector device” is found in “a format selector device” earlier in claim 1. Accordingly, this rejection is believed to be overcome.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at the telephone number provided.

Respectfully submitted,



Victor A. Cardona, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 44,589

Dated: August 11, 2010

HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI, P.C.

5 Columbia Circle

Albany, New York 12203

Telephone: (518) 452-5600

Facsimile: (518) 452-5579